

-6-

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,204). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made to each of the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 to respectively include, at least in part, the subject matter of dependent Claims 3, 10 and 17.

Regarding each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Yinger to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "extracting an installation program from the software installation package."

"If the user clears authorization to install the application module or updates to the application module, the application module or updates are installed 350 by the installation unit 230 from the system application repository 235 on the server computer 110 to the local application repository 270 and the local version repository 275 on the client computer 120." (Col. 6, lines 23-29)

Applicant respectfully asserts that simply installing the application module or updates, as disclosed in Yinger, simply does not meet extracting an installation program from the software installation package, as claimed by applicant.

Further with respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpts from Yinger to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "if the current user does not have sufficient privileges, recovering a set of user credentials that is associated with sufficient privileges to run the installation program from the software installation package, and authenticating to the computer using the set of user credentials."

"If there is a hit that indicates that the user is not authorized to install the application module, then a failure flag is returned 850 to the installation system process and the installation process is halted. If there is no hit, on the userid, the next level of security is

-7-

checked.
The next level from the user level that the security unit
870 checks is the group level." (Col. 10, lines 58-65)

Applicant respectfully asserts that the above excerpt from Yinger does not meet applicant's claimed "recovering a set of user credentials" that is associated with sufficient privileges to run the installation program from the software installation package" if the current user does not have sufficient privileges (emphasis added). Yinger, instead, discloses that an installation process is halted. Thus, there is simply no further authentication based on the claimed condition, let alone an authentication based on a set of user credentials recovered from the software installation package. Applicant emphasizes that this allows the installation program to be run without the current user having sufficient privileges, whereas Yinger requires the current user to have sufficient privileges in order to run the installation program. (See Col. 11, lines 18-23)

To further clarify applicant's claimed "recovering a set of user credentials that is associated with sufficient privileges...from the software installation package," applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the following (or substantially similar, but not identical) claim language:

"wherein the software installation package includes a plurality of sets of user credentials." (See Claims 1, 8 and 15 incorporating respectively the claim language of former dependent Claims 3, 10 and 17, at least in part).

Thus, applicant's claims now further emphasize that when the current user does not have sufficient privileges, a set of user credentials associated with sufficient privileges may be recovered from the software installation package to run the installation program. Only applicant teaches and claims an authentication, in the claimed context, using a set of user credentials that is recovered from such a specific source.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a

-8-

single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Yinger reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the claim limitations, in the context of the remaining elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, Yinger is further deficient with respect to the dependent claims. For example, the Examiner relies on the following excerpts from Yinger to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed, "recovering a second set of user credentials from the plurality of sets of user credentials if the set of user credentials failed during authentication; and authenticating to the computer using the second set of user credentials" (see this or substantially similar claim language in dependent Claims 4 et al.).

"The next level from the user level that the security unit 870 checks is the group level." (Col. 10, lines 64-65)

"Once again, if there is a hit, the flag that is encountered is checked to determine whether there is authorization or not to install the application module. If there is authorization, the security process allows the application to be installed..." (Col. 11, lines 1-4)

Applicant respectfully asserts that the above excerpts from Yinger fail to even suggest "recovering a second set of user credentials from the plurality of sets of user credentials if the user credentials failed during authentication." A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the claim limitations, in the context of the remaining elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings to the Examiner's attention the subject matter of new

-9-

Claims 22-24 below, which have been added for full consideration:

"wherein the user credentials each include a user name and an associated password" (see Claim 22);

"wherein the installation program is run from a remote computer without knowledge of the current user" (see Claim 23); and

"wherein an error message is displayed if none of the plurality of sets of user credentials are associated with sufficient privileges to run the installation program from the software installation package" (see Claim 24).

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of such claim limitations, in the context of the remaining elements, is respectfully requested.

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P262/01.205.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC.

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100